

Remarks**I. Administrative Overview**

Claims 1-30 were previously presented. Claims 1, 11, 13, 16, 26 and 28 are hereby amended. Upon entry of the present amendments, Claims 1-30 are pending. No new matter has been introduced.

The Specification and Abstract have been amended to correct informalities. No new matter has been introduced.

Figures 1A, 1B and 3B have been amended to correct informalities. No new matter has been introduced.

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections and objections levied against the pending claims.

II. Claim Objections

Claims 11 and 13 are objected to for claiming subject matter that duplicates the subject matter claimed in Claims 10 and 12. Applicants contend that Claims 11 and 13 as previously presented do not claim duplicative subject matter. Nevertheless, Claims 11 and 13 have been amended to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter. Upon entry of the present amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 11 and 13 do not claim duplicative subject matter.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement set forth under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, and for failing to comply with the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 1-30 as previously presented comply with all aspects of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Nevertheless, Claims 1, 11, 13, 16, 26 and 28 have been amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention.

Claims are enabled when they clearly claim subject matter so as to enable one of skill in the art to make and use the invention. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 1. Claims

1-30 are sufficiently supported by the Specification such that one of skill in the art could make and use the invention claimed by Claims 1-30.

Independent Claims 1 and 16 claim “a method for providing a uniform network address scheme for a user accessing a computer on a network, independent from the computer the user is accessing”. Support for this section of the claim can be found in the Abstract and in the Specification.¹ One skilled in the art can read the sections of the Specification and Abstract dealing with the above-mentioned claim section, and make and use the invention based on this information. The above-mentioned section of Claims 1 and 16 is therefore enabled.

A claim complies with paragraph 2 of 35 U.S.C. § 112 when it specifically points out and claims subject matter that the Applicant regards as his/her invention. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2. Independent Claims 1 and 16 distinctly point out and claim the Applicants’ invention and so comply with paragraph 2.

The Examiner points out that the clause, “a computer on a network independent from the computer,” in independent Claims 1 and 16 is unclear. Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 1 and 16, as amended, clarify this ambiguity.

The Examiner further points out that the final two limitations of independent Claims 1 and 16 are difficult to understand. While the Applicants thank the Examiner for his suggestion, the Applicants contend that Claims 1 and 16, as amended, clearly point out and claim the Applicants’ intended invention.

Applicants therefore respectfully contend that for the above-mentioned reasons, amended Claims 1-30 comply with the requirements set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 16-18 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hipp in view of Abdo. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection

¹ Support can be found in the abstract, “providing a uniform network addressing scheme for a user accessing a network that is independent from the computer to which the user accesses the network.” *See* Abstract. Support can also be found in the specification: “providing a uniform network addressing scheme to assign a virtual host name.” *See* paragraphs 7-8, and 123.

and submit that Hipp and Abdo, alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claimed invention, as amended.

A claimed invention is obviated only when two or more references either alone, or in combination teach, disclose or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Hipp and Abdo because such a combination would render Hipp unsuitable for its intended purpose. Applicants also submit that even if Hipp and Abdo were able to be combined, neither Hipp or Abdo, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Hipp is directed towards an improved utilization of system resources that migrates and relocates an operating system executing on a server having an insufficient amount of available resources, to another server having a sufficient amount of available resources. *See Hipp*, Col 1. lines 39-59. This application migration allows the system disclosed in Hipp to be node-independent, where a node is defined as a particular machine running a given operating system at a specific moment in time. *See Hipp*, Abstract. In contrast, Abdo uses auto-reconnect requests stored at a server, and auto-authenticate requests stored at a client, to establish or re-establish communications. *See Abdo*, Par. 26-27 and 35. Application migration cannot be accomplished via the system disclosed in Abdo because Abdo does not disclose user session migration, but rather discloses the automatic reconnection and authentication of user sessions. These two technologies are different, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Abdo with Hipp to achieve the system disclosed in Hipp. Further, were one to combine Hipp and Abdo, the combination would be unable to achieve the functionality contemplated by Hipp. Thus, there is no motivation to combine Hipp and Abdo.

Even were one to combine Hipp and Abdo, the resulting combination would fail to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Hipp fails to disclose or suggest a virtual host name able to uniquely identify a user from a plurality of users. Instead, Hipp describes an application that is distinguished from other applications via the combination of a host name and a unique internet protocol address. *See Hipp*, col. 14, lines 4-14. Distinguishing an application from other applications is different from uniquely identifying a user from a plurality of users, because distinguishing a user or

application does not necessarily result in the identification of that user or application.² In Hipp, identification of a distinguished application requires additional information. Thus, Hipp does not disclose uniquely identifying a user from a plurality of users.

The Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Hipp and Abdo. Further, were one motivated to combine Hipp and Abdo, the resulting combination would fail to teach, disclose or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-2, 4-9, 16-18, and 20-24 are patentable over Hipp in view of Abdo.

Claims 3, 14-15, 19 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hipp in view of Abdo, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,689 to Bahlmann (“Bahlmann”). Claims 10-13 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hipp in view of Abdo, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,878,212 to Civanlar (“Civanlar”). Claims 3 and 10-15 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent Claim 1, as amended. Claims 19 and 25-30 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent Claim 16, as amended. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Hipp, Abdo, Bahlmann and Civanlar, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claimed invention.

Bahlmann and Civanlar fail to teach or suggest a host name uniquely identifying a user from a plurality of users and an application being a user session. The Examiner uses Bahlmann only to address claims relating DHCP servers and specific generation of host names, and uses Civanlar to address claims relating association of host names to internet protocol addresses of computers. Like Hipp and Abdo, neither Bahlmann or Civanlar disclose or suggest a host name uniquely identifying a user from a plurality of users. Thus, Bahlmann and Civanlar, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a host name uniquely identifying a user from a plurality of users and an application being a user session.

² - For example, in some embodiments, a host name may comprise a user name and a domain. Such host names can uniquely identify the user and the domain the user on without using any additional identification methods, such as maps, rule engines etc.

Bahlamann and Civanlar, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of amended Claims 1 and 16, as presented above, therefore Hipp, Abdo, Bahlamann and Civanlar, alone or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest the features of dependent Claims 3, 14-15, 19 and 29-30. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3, 14-15, 19 and 29-30 are patentable over Hipp in view of Abdo and in further view of Bahlamann, and Hipp in view of Abdo and in further view of Civanlar. Applicants therefore request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all rejections made under 35 U.S.C. §103.

V. Conclusion

The Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and that all of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' agent would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' agent at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP

Date: July 14, 2008

/Kellan D. Ponikiewicz/
Kellan D. Ponikiewicz
Registration Number: 59,701

Patent Group
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 502-5002